Vol. X, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 21, 1953

WE NEED A WASHINGTON-BONN AXIS

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

THE SWEEPING POPULAR endorsement of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, with his pro-Western, anti-Communist orientation in foreign affairs and his consistent maintenance of a free market economy at home, in the West German election of September 6, supplies the final, clinching argument that Germany today is potentially our strongest and most dependable ally on the continent of Europe. While the West Germans have testified with their votes, the East Germans have testified by their widespread heroic uprising against the Soviet Communist puppet regime last June, and subsequent smaller demonstrations.

In a free election and with a high turnout of voters, the Communists in West Germany got 2.2 per cent of the total vote — the poorest showing of the Party since it was organized after the end of World War I. In East Germany, which has not forgotten the indescribable outrages of the invading Soviet troops, and which has experienced every conceivable form of pillage and exploitation under Soviet occupation, it is safe to assume that Communism is even more hated than in West Germany. If the Soviet troops were withdrawn it would not be physically safe for anyone to pose there as a Communist sympathizer.

Compare this anti-Communist spirit in Germany with the situation in France, where the Communists regularly poll about one-fourth of the votes and control the principal trade unions, or in Italy, where more than one-third of the voters supported the Communists and pro-Communist Nenni socialists in the last election. And in choosing allies, spirit is all-important. During a trip in Europe last summer I found American military officers and civilian officials almost lyrical in their appreciation of Turkey, with its hundred per cent anti-Communist feeling and its willingness to do even more than the American advisors recommended in building up national defense.

And Turkey is still a relatively retarded country, educationally and economically, far inferior to Germany in manpower, technical capacity and industrial resources. A rearmed Germany, backed by American military and industrial power, would change the balance of European ground power, from the present lopsided Soviet predominance to something much closer to equilibrium. And it is the only means of achieving such a change and thereby making sense out of America's present commitment to the ground defense of Western Europe.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THERE COULD BE SOME IMPROVEMENT in French military strength in Europe if the war in Indo-China could be brought to an end. But this is a very big If. Great Britain has a much larger peacetime army now than it maintained before the Second World War; and this army is scattered over the globe in actual or potential trouble spots, from Germany to Malaya and Hong Kong. The military effort of the smaller countries of northern and western Europe is limited by population and size. Only in Germany could there be — in a relatively short time — a significant build-up in the strength of the western coalition.

In appraising the military value of an ally, past performance must be taken into consideration. The showing of France and Italy, the other two large west European powers, in the last war, was not very encouraging. And the national cohesion and unity of both of these countries since the end of the war has been deeply affected by the cancer of Communism.

A book that has enjoyed a considerable sale in Germany recently is entitled, *Soldat bis zum letzten Tage,* ("Soldier to the Last Day"), by General Kesselring, who commanded the masterly defensive campaigns of the German forces in Italy. The title is a good expression of a German spirit that is highly appreciated by American military officers. Every American officer with whom I talked during a visit to Europe last summer, from General Alfred Gruenther, commander of the NATO forces, down, was eager for a German military contribution.

And it is likely that many, if not all military experts of every nationality, if they were talking off the record, would agree that the holding of Western Europe against a determined Soviet onslaught without German participation would be militarily impossible.

THERE ARE THREE FAMILIAR arguments against German rearmament. These are often put forward by persons whose past records indicate, if not Communist sympathy, at least rather striking insensitiveness to the danger of aggressive Soviet imperialism. However, these arguments should be considered on their merits.

First, there is the suggestion that Germany will turn against the West. Second, there is the somewhat contradictory fear that a rearmed Germany would pull the West into a war designed to recover German lost territory east of the Oder-Neisse boundary. Third, it is argued that the Germans themselves do not wish to rearm and that it is, therefore, both wrong and futile for the United States to try to promote such rearmament.

The first suggestion is fantastically out of line with realistic probability. It would be politically and militarily impossible for a German army dependent on the United States for its best modern equipment to turn against France and there would be no plausible reason for such a move. Germany's big lost areas are in the East. The prevalent German attitude toward France is not one of hatred and desire for revenge, such as one might have found in the time of Louis XIV and Napoleon, when France loomed up as a mighty in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vading foe. It is rather one of pity, perhaps rather condescending pity, for the failure of the French to put their house in political and economic order after the war.

There are several reasons why it is most unlikely that a rearmed Germany would drag other countries into war to regain its lost provinces. In the first place, no suggested scheme of German rearming contemplates a German independent army free from some form of international control. If the European Army plan which Adenauer favors finally prevails against French stalling and obstruction, the future German armed forces will be part of a larger European Army composed of the contingents of six nations, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg. This army would be under the political control of a six-nation authority.

Should Germany be rearmed as a member of NATO, which some of the persons with whom I talked in Europe, both Germans and non-Germans, consider a more feasible and simpler military project, there would be the same check on any German isolated move; the United States and Great Britain, as well as other NATO states, would have to be consulted. Should France block both the European Army and the admission of Germany to NATO the United States would be well advised to choose one of two drastic alternatives: independent rearming of Germany on the basis of a bilateral agreement or abandonment of any commitment to the ground defense of Europe. Should the first alternative be chosen, it would be practically impossible for Germany to act without prior consultation with Washington.

Finally, the Germans, as a militarily realistic people, would not throw their twelve projected divisions against the enormously superior forces of the Soviet bloc, even if there were no political inhibitions.

As for the argument that the Germans do not wish to rearm, the outcome of the election furnishes emphatic confirmation of an impression which I received during a trip of several weeks, in the course of which I talked with a considerable number of Germans of quite varied political views. Three years ago there was some vague and cloudy pacifism and still more nihilistic "ohne uns" ("Without us") sentiment in Germany.

This was a product of psychological shellshock from defeat, or hangovers of Morgenthauism in occupation policy. Today this mood, so far as I could gather, is very much on the decline; and the election figures prove this. Chancellor Adenauer has been a firm, consistent champion of a rearmed Germany within the framework of a closely united anti-Communist Western Europe. And he certainly did not pussyfoot on this issue during the election campaign.

There were two political groups that flatly opposed German rearmament in alliance with the West, the Communists and the All-German Party, a mixture of pacifists and fellow-travellers. Neither of these parties elected a single deputy to the Bundestag. Chancellor Adenauer's party, the Christian Democratic Union, came back fifty per cent stronger than it was in the Bundestag elected in 1949. There could hardly have been a more decisive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular verdict. The Germans are not eager to put on uniforms, any more than the average young American likes to go to Korea or some other foreign country as a soldier. But, in their majority, they are now convinced that neutralism is an impossible policy for a country in Germany's political and geographical position. And when they are allowed to take their stand (a stand Germany occupied at times during the Middle Ages) as the eastern march of western civilization they can be depended on to live up to Kesselring's slogan: "Soldat bis zum letzten Tage."

THE RESULTS OF the German Election should discredit once and for all the undiscriminating anti-German school of reporting, based on preconceived prejudices and obsolete wartime hates, of which Drew Middleton, of the *New York Times,* was the most conspicuous practitioner, but which found all too many imitators and echoes. One of the favorite legends of this school of "reporting" was that there was a Nazi under every German bed. Another was that most Germans had a "plague on both their houses" attitude toward both the Soviet Union and the West. Then the assumption was put in circulation that Adenauer was unfit for recognition as a "democrat" because in personality he was not the folksy, backslapping type of American Congressman.

How do the first two legends stand up, in the light of the election figures? There was one group, the German Reich Party, which could have been plausibly represented as neo-Nazi in ideology; and it polled 1.1% of the vote, less than the Communists. There was one party, the All-Germany Party, which plugged the line that Germany should take sides neither with the West nor with the East. It did not elect a single candidate.

As for the idea that we can accept as allies only countries which are made over in our own political, economic and social image, this is a silly missionary delusion which is overripe for the wastebasket. Adenauer is a better potential American ally because he is emphatically not an American puppet, but a German patriot, who stands for German interests and ideals.

The potentially strongest nation in continental Europe is our most dependable potential ally, not because it has been bought (economic aid to Germany has almost ceased), not because it has been coerced, but because its interests coincide with ours. To seize this opportunity, to create a firm Washington-Bonn axis may well be a decisive test of the Eisenhower-Dulles statesmanship. The first step is to make it clear that we will not accept a permanent French veto on German rearmament, which is equivalent to a veto on the effective defense of Europe.

We call attention to Mr. Chamberlin's latest book, just out, entitled *Beyond Containment* (Regnery, $5.00). As we said of the author in our review of the book last week: "He knows Russia, he knows Communism, and in the light of that knowledge he explains why the commissars did what they did when the Allies, particularly the U.S., presented them with opportunities."

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 42 Wednesday, October 21, 1953 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OCT 28 '53

The Robber Bosses: The power of the GOP faces its greatest threat — expressed in lurid headlines the country over — since inauguration day. Panic spreads among some party ranks. Yet, paradoxically, the worried party leaders might find in this menace, which has suddenly arisen, the very source of the party's salvation; that is, if they courageously grasp the nettle — and crush it.

The threat we mean is not the Democratic victory in the by-election among the farmers of Wisconsin's 9th District. As we pointed out last week, this district was never held by real Republicans in the past quarter of a century. Last week, the seat passed logically from a New Dealer who temporarily bore the GOP label to a Democrat New Dealer. The significance of this "GOP defeat" has been greatly exaggerated and misunderstood.

The real threat to the GOP comes from quite a different part of the country than Wisconsin. It comes from the Eastern states where the Party is suffering deep convulsions.

The plain fact is that the revelations about high GOP figures and their associations with labor criminals in New York and New Jersey has shaken the section of the Republicans which did so much to place Eisenhower at the head of his party a year ago last July in Chicago. Dewey was the backbone of this section of the GOP and his Lt. Governor Arthur Wicks is now openly and confessedly linked with Joe Fay, the notorious labor extortionist now residing in prison. But leaders of the machine of Governor Driscoll of New Jersey are also tarred by proven relationship with this criminal. In short, the sewers are opened and the public is shocked. But is that all?

A second look reveals a deeper significance. These are the very state machines (plus Governor Fine's in Pennsylvania, Lodge's in Connecticut and Sherman Adams's in New Hampshire, all more or less having trouble today) which put over Ike in Chicago. They, plus their Wall Street backers and the station wagon set, blocked the popular arising which was known as the Taft movement. A large part of this movement was the people's revolt against political and — more particularly — labor bosses. Taft, be it noted, had no state political bosses and no patronage to match the big battalions ranged against him in his fight for the nomination.

This basic conflict — obscured by shamefully mendacious journalism at the time, "Taft is trying to steal the nomination", etc. — has continued right down to today. Now Dewey, the Driscoll machine in New Jersey, Lodge and his outfit in Connecticut are in trouble. In fact, the whole structure which put over Eisenhower in Chicago and has been feeding on the fruits of victory ever since is in trouble. But does that betoken the downfall of the GOP? Not necessarily.

Here is where opportunity lifts the knocker outside. The force of popular revulsion against the labor leaders rises higher and higher — and electorally, this is the best field for the GOP politicos to furrow, if they would only realize it. Much more accurately than twenty years ago, when the capitalists were designated "the robber barons", today the labor leaders may be termed the "robber bosses". So far only the dead Taft perceived the real issue and had the courage to take up the people's case against a new tyranny. Yet the White House — run by the New Deal Republican Sherman Adams and, on labor questions, by a New Jersey man, Bernard Shanley — blindly tries to play ball with these "robber bosses". And Governor Dewey?

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The man in Albany faces the greatest crisis of his career. A New Deal Republican who has coddled the "robber bosses", he must clean out the mess in his state or retire from politics.

But whatever he decides to do, an opportunity awaits the more constructive forces in the Republican Party (aided by the conservative Democrats) to grapple courageously with this issue which — more than the farm problem — may decide the party's fate.

Not Merely Gossip: Talk in the corridors of the State Department is that its No. 2 man, Undersecretary Walter Bedell ("Beetle") Smith, will soon resign to take a job in the White House. If Smith leaves the State Department, it will be good news to most of the Republicans on Capitol Hill — for to Smith has been attributed most of the responsibility for keeping Acheson holdovers in the Department, despite demands from Congress to get them out.

● The town is buzzing with speculation about the charge by Bob Wagner, the Democratic candidate for New York Mayor, that an "important national Republican figure" also urged release of Joe Fay, the notorious racketeer now in prison. One guess is that it is a recent appointee to the bench.

● It happened a few months ago at a function on Oyster Bay, Long Island, celebrating the creation of Sagamore Hill as a national monument in honor of President Theodore Roosevelt. Mrs. Grace Roosevelt, wife of Colonel Archibald Roosevelt, only surviving son of T.R., met Winthrop Aldrich, U.S. Ambassador to the court of St. James. Mrs. Roosevelt bantered: "Winthrop, I hope you are acting as the U.S. Ambassador to England, not as British Ambassador to the U.S., like Walter Hines Page." (Historical writers have remarked that Page, Wilson's Ambassador to England during World War I, was anxious to forward British interests more often than American.) The quip went the rounds at the gathering and former President Hoover was heard to laugh heartily.

● One of the sad spectacles of Washington today is Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson — a casualty of the first round of the GOP Administration. Benson was an opponent of price supports and controls in Agriculture. The developing distress in agriculture with its political repercussions forced the Administration to change its tack on the question of supports. Benson has gone along. Why — many ask — did not Benson stick to his guns, hand in his resignation and wait for a later and more propitious time to put forward his ideas again? The answer is a melancholy one — "Potomac fever". Apparently the Secretary had become captivated by the life in Washington, the association with other important men, the vistas of power and position, the feeling of "being in the swim" — in short "Potomac fever", one of the most potent factors operating in the center of politics today.

On the Firing Line: Many business executives have rebelled against a current drive to rally important executives behind United Nations Week. We select two who have made their opposition particularly vocal. Mr. Philip Le Boutillier, President of Best & Company, Fifth Avenue store, is one of the leaders in the country's retail merchandising field. After receipt of a letter from about 1000 business sponsors of the UN Week idea, Le Boutillier writes to one of them, Harvey Firestone, Jr., as follows:

"The real purpose of your soliciting funds is not to tell the facts but to perpetuate the UN folly, whose next goal is the admission of Red China to the UN. It is alarming how men with the financial responsibilities of yourself and the imposing list of 918 industrial and related tycoons, given in your 1953 Business and Industrial Committee for United Nations Week, can be so blind as to what goes on and why. A few big industrial leaders endorse something and hundreds rush to follow like sheep. Your father was never led by the nose by a lot of hucksters and internationalist dreamers . . . ."

Another business leader is Joseph S. Kimmel, President of the Republic Electric Company of Davenport, Ia. In the house organ of his firm, "Sparks", Kimmel speaks his mind thus: "The United Nations, if carried to its logical conclusion, will constitute a fraud and conspiracy to deprive Americans of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their rights as free men and American citizens. It was conceived in iniquity and born in sin in San Francisco, April, 1946, with Alger Hiss the midwife and by him delivered to the United States Senate."

Fort Monmouth: When Sen. McCarthy discovered the Ft. Monmouth spy ring which has been carrying our precious radar secrets to the other side of the Iron Curtain, he was only inspecting a trail which led back to Washington. The radar laboratories in Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey, are under the Signal Corps of the U.S. Army. The first spy scandals involving the Signal Corps broke in the Pentagon almost two years ago. The furtive and lame statements of Signal Corps authorities in New Jersey today are matched by similar utterances from some embarrassed and worried officials in Signal Corps Intelligence in the Pentagon at that time.

The most devastating aspect of such a case as that at Ft. Monmouth is not the presence of Red spies and traitors; it is the moral paralysis of some "higher ups" who permit the spies to remain, or who deliberately overlook the possibility of subversion, for fear of offending certain political circles. If officials had not, two years ago, feared the hand of the Truman Administration, raised as usual against those who sought to root out the termites, the loss of radar secrets and the ghastly spectacle of traitors breaking down and confessing, or hiding behind the 5th Amendment, would not have followed. If authorities had then — such is the judgment of those here who knew about this scandal — prosecuted an inquiry into why a certain register of top-level secret documents was mysteriously burned in 1951, then McCarthy might never have had to go into the Ft. Monmouth matter.

This is not, unfortunately, a new story in the Capital. It is a story of cowardice, fear of loss of a job or of promotion, among those who should stamp out these nests of traitors. The moral rot — after years of Truman and Roosevelt — has gone deeply.

Why They Go Up: Twenty years ago the Banking Board of the State of New York set a top limit on the interest rates a saving bank may pay to its depositors; also, dividend limits were lifted because an investor in a bank is also a saver. Last week the Board eliminated these maximums. Why?

Regardless of the official explanations, the plain fact is that the action was made necessary by the ineluctable pressure of economic forces. Here we have another example of how the market place operates with utter disregard of the economic planners. The banks must pay more to savers because they must induce more savings, and the reason for this is that there are more calls on the banks by borrowers. The *New York Times* (October 11) reports that the "earnings and assets of big New York banks climbed in the third quarter above 1952 levels" and ascribes this increase to "a higher level of business borrowings at firmer interest rates". That is, business needs capital and is willing to pay the going price for the loan of capital.

Suppose the fiction of an official maximum on interest rates was continued. The banks would not get the savings, simply because business, in need of capital, would appeal to the savers directly with the promise of higher returns; industrial bonds, common stocks and mortgages would get much of the savings that ordinarily go to the banks. If a thorough investigation were made, it would show that the action of the Banking Board followed from the fact that savings were being thus diverted from the banks, and that this pressure from the operation of the free market place compelled the lifting of the interest-dividend rates. This again shows that economic planning is only a conceit of the planners. It simply does not work.

●

Unconditional Hatred: German War Guilt and the Future of Europe, by Captain Russell Grenfell, R.N. Devin-Adair Company. New York. $3.75. Reviewed by Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes.

If the classic phrase "a Daniel come to judgment" was ever true and appropriate in connection with a book, it is surely relevant to this absorbing volume by one of the most distinguished of English authori-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties on naval strategy and history. Here he proves himself equally capable as a political historian, analyst and critic.

Unconditional Hatred is Revisionism with a vengeance and on a majestic scale. Captain Grenfell seeks to set the overall international political record straight from 1900 to the present time.

This is, admittedly, a large order. But it must be conceded that the Captain successfully performs the feat with great skill. It is the sober judgment of the reviewer that it exposes and debunks more important and mischievous misconceptions and hypocritical pretense in the realm of public affairs than any other book of its size published in the last fifty years.

The theme of *Unconditional Hatred* is the vast and unnecessary price paid in lives, money, resources, public morale and human happiness as a result of handling world affairs on the basis of irrational hatreds and emotionalism rather than through reason and realism. Within this general framework of the high cost of hatred as the sovereign guide of politicians since 1900, Captain Grenfell gives special attention to the disastrous results, especially for Britain, of the baseless hatred of Germany since around 1890, and particularly since 1914. This hatred was spawned and nourished by English jingoes, especially the slanderers of Germany, such as Vansittart, whose vicious myth is without foundation in fact or logic.

Americans who are convinced that it was a mistake for the United States to enter either World War will gain confirmation from Captain Grenfell's book. He even adduces plenty of evidence that England, also, should never have entered either war. She probably would not have done so had it not been for the fact that, from 1905 to 1914, she had a vain charlatan at the head of the Foreign Office and that, in March, 1939, Neville Chamberlain drew a mental blank long enough to guarantee Poland.

Much space is given to a critical appraisal of the "statecraft" and military leadership of Winston Churchill, which is like a breath of fresh air after all of the reverential credulity which has been bestowed on "the British bulldog" for nearly a decade and a half. Churchill's chief mistake was that he tried to play the role of a "Whitehall Napoleon" — directly controlling all army and navy strategy — rather than assuming his proper function of a "Downing Street statesman".

Grenfell pays a fitting tribute to Churchill for his great feat in inspiring the English people to make a supreme war effort, but he believes that Churchill badly bungled strategy on both land and sea many times and thereby needlessly prolonged the war for at least a year. He had no ultimate war goal whatever beyond destroying the Nazis. He committed the supreme folly of acquiescing in Roosevelt's policy of unconditional surrender and brushed aside invaluable strategic opportunities for a negotiated peace.

Captain Grenfell has a plan for the future as bold and uncompromising as his criticism of the past. He believes that any scheme for world government is completely impractical for many decades to come — he has no faith in the United Nations. He looks upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as little more than a mere temporizing expedient without permanence or stability. He proposes a real political union of Great Britain, France and Germany, in which Britain and Germany are likely to be the only really powerful factors in restraining potential Russian aggression. He believes that, if this "Third Force" can be created and strengthened, it will be the best defense of Western Europe against bellicose pressures from either the United States or Russia.

He advises the United States to take advantage of its invulnerable position and power to "sit tight and watch other people's squabbles with an amused detachment and economic advantage". But he sees little prospect that Americans will act with any such wisdom because "the former strong American instinct for the strict avoidance of foreign entanglements seems to have given place to the almost opposite urge for the United States to push its way into any outside trouble wherever in the world it may occur".

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED